

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/804,511	03/19/2004	Isabella Brehm	512425-2102	7644	
7590 07/12/2005			EXAMINER		
William F. Lawrence, Esq. c/o FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP			ZIMMER, MARC S		
745 Fifth Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
New York, NY 10151			1712		
·		•	DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10/804,511	BREHM ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Marc S. Zimmer	1712					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	dress				
THE - Exter after - If the - If NC - Failu	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replayer of the provision of the pr	. 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tiply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) dated will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONI	mely filed ys will be considered timel n the mailing date of this or ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03/	19/04 and the interview of 06/14/0	<u>05</u> .					
2a) <u></u> □	ı) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.							
3)□								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 25 and 26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
· ·	Claim(s) <u>13</u> is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are objected to.							
8)[_]	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicati	on Papers							
	9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10))☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PT	O-152.				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig		ı)-(d) or (f).					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documer							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer			Ct				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prices application from the International Russes	•	ed in this National	Stage				
* 5	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
	and and and addition of a list	To any continue deplos not receive	· ·					
Attachmen	t(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)								
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	oate Patent Application (PTC)-152)					
	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/19/04</u> .	6) Other:	and the spendador (in the					

Application/Control Number: 10/804,511 Page 2

Art Unit: 1712

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

 Claims 1-24, drawn to a method of making alkoxy-functionalized polyorganosiloxanes, classified in class 528, subclass 12.

II. Claims 25-26, drawn to products prepared using an alkoxy-functionalized polyorganosiloxane, classified in class 106, subclass 287.16.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). Certainly, the materials made by the processes recited in claims 1-24 can be used in a multitude of applications however the larger issue is that claims 25 and 26 are product-by-process claims wherein the alkoxy-functionalized polyorganosiloxane mentioned therein is not required to have been made by the method of the claims of group I. "Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-byprocess claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process" In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Hence, the scope of claims 25 and 26 is such that they essentially claim any ink, paint, cosmetic, etc.

containing a similar compound derived from any synthetic approach. In this sense, they are patentably distinct and restriction is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group II is not required for Group I, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Howard Lee on June 14, 2005 a provisional election was made WITH traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-24. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 25 and 26 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Objections

Claims 1-24 are objected to because, insofar as Applicant requires there to be at least one Si-H group per molecule, the variable "y" must be greater than zero. Also, with respect to component (B), "polyunsaturated aliphatic alcohol" is mentioned twice.

Claim 3 is objected to because "arylamino" is not a type of alcohol. Further, were the word "alcohol" to be inserted after "arylamino", there would then be redundancy in the claim as this genus of materials is already mentioned.

Claim 8 is objected to make it doesn't make sense to say that the salt of an organic acid is carboxylic acid. Rather, the salt of the organic acid is the salt of a carboxylic acid.

Claim 9 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

In claim 13, "styrene/butene oxide-containing polyether" should be replaced with "polyether derived from styrene/butene oxide".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. There is no antecedent basis in claim 1 for the ordinary alcohols methanol and ethanol as there is no mention <u>saturated</u> aliphatic alcohol as component (B).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-24 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the various objections and rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action. While the utilization of acids as dehydrocondensation catalyst are well known, there was no suggestion of using combinations of acids and acid salts to promote this

Art Unit: 1712

reaction. Indeed, the prior art appears to not contain any evidence that it was known to use acid salts in this capacity. In fact, U.S. Patent # 6.593,436 actually indicates that acid salts *prevent* dehydrocondensation (column 9, lines 18-22).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc S. Zimmer whose telephone number is 571-272-1096. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

July 8, 2005

Marc Zimmer AV 1711